



**Work Group Meeting #6 - Notes**

<b>Draft Rule/Policy Component</b>	<b>Work Group Feedback</b>
Accountability - EFA Parent Satisfaction Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The group thought that this was a strong component to capture accountability from a family’s perspective.</li> <li>● The proposed questions for the survey were considered fair and similar to other parent surveys the group had seen in the past.</li> <li>● There was discussion around the definition of 'high quality education' being different for families wanting different outcomes from their child’s education.</li> </ul>
Academic accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The group agreed with the general approach and rigor to this approach.</li> <li>● Clarification was provided that the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile benchmark was set at that level due to comparison with other states. In general, the group felt it was a good benchmark if anything, it was quite low.</li> <li>● It was raised that the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile benchmark would vary significantly depending on the test. On a national exam, this would be a very different benchmark than to the state test of AR for example.</li> </ul>
Accreditation approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The group discussed various accrediting bodies and how they differ from ANSAA.</li> <li>● Ideas were floated about how to verify the rigor of some other accrediting bodies.</li> <li>● Emphasis was placed on ensuring that accrediting bodies have site visits.</li> <li>● A question was asked about how accreditation would work for schools with virtual education.</li> </ul>
Unreasonable tuition inflation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This had been discussed at length in previous Work Group sessions and members agreed that the proposed rules were fair.</li> </ul>



Service providers

- Much discussion was had upon this topic of service providers. While the group agreed there can be some exceptional benefits of some service providers, it is also an area of this EFA program that requires a set of rigorous accountability rules to ensure service provider validity.
- The group concluded that proven experience was an important factor when determining eligible providers
- Key strategic questions that came up:
  - Should ADE regulate how much a service provider can charge?
  - How do we ensure service provider quality?
    - One idea was that a service provider (including micro schools) would have to have prior experience (e.g., 3 year minimum)
  - What are the standards or accrediting processes for these service providers?
  - What are benchmark states doing for this approach to service providers?
  - Is there a way initially to cap how much a service provider as an individual can receive?
  - Can there be a duration of time acting as a service provider to be eligible for state funding?